



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

feu; p. 371: 329—The appositive use of *de* in such phrases as *un diable d'homme* might be explained and illustrated; p. 372 b—The rendering "at (or to) the home of" of *chez* is not sufficient, and will inevitably lead, at times, to incorrect translations.

The following points should be treated; the use of *à* to denote a characteristic. The use of *à* after *être*, as in *il est à plaindre* (possibly in § 78 b).¹ The formation of adverbs by the addition of *-ment*. The use of *ou . . . ou* and of *soit . . . soit* (or *ou*). The use of *que* to avoid the repetition of such adverbs as *quoique*, *lorsque*, *quand*, etc. An explanation of these and other common points would be expected in a grammar intended to cover two or more years of study.

The foregoing remarks have been made only after a cursory glance through the grammar, not after a use of this work in the class-room, and these criticisms are not offered with any intention of fault-finding; they may not even appeal to the best judgment of teachers, but they indicate, to a certain degree, the weak points of Mr. Grandgent's grammar. They are, however, of very minor importance when contrasted with the general excellence of his work. "The Essentials of French Grammar" will be welcomed by all teachers as a useful help in the study of French, and will appeal with especial force to instructors who prefer the author's order in the treatment of his subject to the method employed in the majority of French grammars published in America.

EDWIN S. LEWIS,

Princeton University.

MODERN GERMAN LITERATURE.

Die deutsche Litteratur des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Von DR. RICHARD M. MEYER. (*Das Neunzehnte Jahrhundert in Deutschlands Entwicklung*, Bd. III.) 2te Auflage. Berlin: G. Bondi, 1900. Pp. xxii, 960.

IT is a reproach brought against German literature that criticism has always followed too closely on the heels of creative work, that it

¹ Here is an illustration of deficiency in the Index. The paragraph dealing with the passive rendering of an active infinitive is not given under the heading "infinitive;" The proper reference is placed under "*faire*" and "*lasser*;" fortunately it is the first given under these headings.

has even occasionally attempted to steal a march upon poetry. The analytical and critical tendency in the German mind has no doubt robbed German poetry in the last two centuries of a certain *naïveté* which belongs to it by nature; for the German national temperament, compared, for instance, with that of the Latin peoples, is essentially *naïve*. On the other hand, it may fairly be urged that German literature might never have attained classic dignity at all, had it not been for the active interference of criticism. However this may be, the gulf between the wholly uncritical poetry of the German Middle Ages and the theory-ridden literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is so great that it is sometimes difficult to conceive of both as coming from the same race; in no literature is it so hard to recognize a process of continuous evolution from the earliest beginnings to the present day as in that of Germany; indeed, were it not for the existence of an unbroken *Volkslitteratur* which forms the basis for such an evolution, it would be impossible. In even the least balanced *Flegeljahre* of New High German literature there is, if the expression be permissible, a certain *Zielbewusstsein*; the critic and the theorist seem to be standing constantly in the background, explaining how certain results have been arrived at and marking the lines on which the literature of the future must develop. To appreciate the present volume, this prerogative, which German criticism, back to the times of Opitz and Gottsched, has so persistently assumed, must be borne in mind; Professor Meyer does not merely write history; he also takes an active share in the literary evolution of the moment.

Whether this quality of *Zielbewusstsein* is to be regarded as an evil or not, it at least materially lightens the task of the literary historian, and especially the historian of recent and contemporary literature. German literature in the nineteenth century has not been one whit less confused or confusing than that of any other European people, but the mere fact that the Germans have had clearer ideas than other nations as to what their literature was doing, and whither it was tending, has made the task of writing the history of that literature easier. The path which the modern historian of German literature must tread is pretty well marked

out for him; and there are certain broad movements which mark clearly where one chapter ought to end and another begin. In one respect, however, Professor Meyer has refused to profit by these natural advantages; he has preferred to divide his book artificially into ten chapters, each chapter being devoted to a decade. But he has himself obviously felt the limitations of this method, for he often groups together writers who show marked affinities in spite of the fact that their work belongs to different decades. We find, for instance, Gottfried Keller, Theodor Fontane and Fritz Reuter discussed in Chapter v (1840-50), although all belong, as a matter of strict chronology, to the second half of the century; and such examples might be multiplied. The division into decades can, after all, only be regarded as a preliminary to something better. Professor Meyer has not, it is satisfactory to see, allowed himself to be too much hampered by it, and it has at least the redeeming feature of keeping before the reader the synchronism of literary events. The student who approaches modern German literature on more organic principles is too apt to overlook the inevitable overlapping of literary movements. A more serious charge that must be brought against the work is that it is not, as its title would imply, so much a History of German Literature in the Nineteenth Century, as a History of Contemporary German Literature, with an introduction on the literature of the early Nineteenth Century; the first two decades of the century receive eighty-nine pages, the last two one hundred and eighty-seven. For this, Professor Meyer's excuse is

"dass wir für die Epoche bis zu Goethes Tod Darstellungen haben, die mit vollem Recht längst in den nationalen Besitz übergegangen sind, während für die neuere Zeit viel weniger brauchbare Vorarbeiten vorlagen, als für andere Gebiete."

But such a reason can hardly be accepted as valid. The phrase "bis zu Goethes Tod," which occurs on the title of so many histories of German literature, is in almost every case an excuse for not doing the literature of the first third of the century justice, for regarding it merely by the reflected light of Goethe's glory; I can think of no work—certainly not Julian Schmidt's—in which an honest attempt

is made to see in it the beginning of a new era. The contemporary critics of German literature from 1800 to 1830 had, it may seem paradoxical to say it, clearer ideas of the value and significance of that literature than the critics of the next generation who, one and all, allowed themselves to be blinded by the re-discovery of Goethe's greatness. Even so great a critic as Dr. Georg Brandes, lecturing in Copenhagen in 1874, could only see the goal of the German literary movement of the beginning of the century in the Revolution of 1848. This was, however, a great point gained, for the academic standpoint had hitherto been to consider that literature as something purely *Epigonenhaftes*. But it seems to me that we must go still further before justice is done to the literature of these decades; we must bring into prominence the elements in it which differentiate it from the literature of the eighteenth century; we must see in it the first important stage in that conflict between Hegelian collectivism, on the one hand, and individualism on the other, which gives the European literature of the entire nineteenth century its distinctive coloring. Only from such a standpoint can we, it seems to me, realize the enormous significance of German Romanticism for the development of European literature. I do not know whether Professor Meyer is in sympathy with such a point of view, but he is too acute and stimulating a critic, too warmly in sympathy with modern ideas, not to help us materially in revising our ideas on this subject. For this reason it is to be regretted that he did not begin his history in earnest with the year 1798, the birth-year of the Romantic School, instead of waiting until Goethe was dead.

Although the first twenty or thirty years of the literature of the century are thus treated in a somewhat *stiefmütterlich* fashion, the perspective and proportions of the rest of the volume are good. The authors whom Dr. Meyer brings into the foreground are no longer the mediocre novelists and poets who, in the belief that they were keeping alive the classical traditions, only succeeded in being *hausbacken*, authors whom it used to be fashionable to read—in England at least—as typical specimens of German literature in the nineteenth cen-

tury. The literary movement which drew its inspiration from Munich in the sixties and seventies must, I fear, be held responsible for the contemptuous shrug with which the educated Englishman still tells you that Germany has only produced one writer of eminence since Goethe. The views which Dr. Meyer expresses, and the criticism which he gives us, have a distinctly cosmopolitan flavor; it is the kind of criticism which can be offered to a French or English reader with some hope of its being convincing; the point of view is, in essentials, at least, rarely merely German. This is to me the importance of this work as compared with older books covering a similar field.

To turn to a few details. The pages on Grillparzer are finely conceived and full of fresh ideas; it is pleasing to find Professor Meyer writing so warmly of Grillparzer's *Libussa*, which has long enough been passed over cursorily as a mere "book-drama." One looks, by the way, in vain for another *Libussa* in the book, a play that should have had some notice in a history of the nineteenth century, Brentano's masterpiece, *Die Gründung Prags*. That Gottfried Keller is "der grösste Schöpfergeist" in German literature since Goethe is, apart from the danger of superlatives, surely not a very happy characterization; the kind of greatness which Keller possessed was not, I think, pre-eminently creative greatness. No one can wish to underrate Keller's magnificent epic genius, but, after all, he had his limitations. It may seem heresy to say it, but there are pages in Keller—and not only in *Martin Salander*—where the punctilious German *Beamter*, with his love for the exact and the petty, is more in evidence than the creative poet. Hebbel and Ludwig are well characterized and contrasted; Meyer emphasizes excellently the peculiar rôle which Hebbel played as an innovator in the development of the German drama, a rôle which has brought him, within the last few years, into extraordinary prominence. The warm enthusiasm for Germany's greatest poetess, Annette Droste-Hülshoff—an enthusiasm which Professor Meyer had already expressed in an excellent essay in his volume of *Deutsche Charaktere*,¹

¹ Berlin: E. Hofman, 1897.

—is as welcome as the condemnation of the *Mirza Schaffy* order of lyric which predominated in the fifties and sixties. In his criticism of Heine, on the other hand, there is a singular lack of freshness. The most serious flaw in the matter of proportion seems to me the space given to Theodor Fontane. I am afraid Dr. Meyer has here allowed the fascination of one of the most charming personalities in modern literature to interfere with his purely critical judgment; it becomes a matter of personal taste and not of literary history, when Professor Meyer devotes to Fontane twenty-eight pages, and to Spielhagen, a much more important factor in the evolution of the modern novel, only five. That time has lain heavily on Spielhagen's work is unfortunately true, but it ought not to be forgotten that there was a generation of critics, before the brothers Hart, who had quite as high an opinion of *Problematische Naturen* as we to-day have of *Effi Briest*. I doubt very much if the next generation will read Fontane with as much patience as the present generation still reads its Spielhagen. No one will grudge the space given to Anzengruber, Sudermann, and Hauptmann; although here, too, a word might be said on the subject of due proportion. The pages on Hauptmann contain, moreover, some of the best and most illuminating criticism in the book. Wildenbruch is, on the whole, justly estimated, but it offends one's sense of fair play to find that judgment based on *Wilhelm*, one of Wildenbruch's weakest pieces. In the later chapters, I fail occasionally to follow Dr. Meyer in his somewhat strongly expressed likes and dislikes. Why, to take one example, is Helene Böhlau praised so warmly and Gabriele Reuter so heartily condemned? In the verse of one of the newest of the new poets, Stefan George, to find "einen Abglanz homerischer Kunst" savours too much of impressionist journalism. A writer like Ferdinand von Saar, who, with the exception of Heyse, at his best, seems to me the greatest living master of the short story, might have had more space allotted to him; and indeed, the contemporary Austrian writers are all unduly overshadowed by their North German colleagues. I am inclined to think that there is at the present moment more promise for

the future of German poetry in Vienna than in Berlin.

Professor Meyer's History of Modern German Literature is thus essentially a personal book, a book from an individual standpoint; one might even describe it as the expression in criticism of the literary creed of the last twenty years in Germany. The newest Young Germany has become what it is because it has appreciated the greatness in Grillparzer and Hebbel, in Heine and Droste-Hülshoff, in Keller and Conrad Ferdinand Meyer. Dr. Meyer's book is thus in itself as much a *mémoire pour servir* as the literature of the last twenty years which it discusses; but it is an indifferent tribute to a work of criticism to say that it is only a document for the use of the future historian; and this work is certainly more. One can conceive of a history of German literature in the nineteenth century being written from a different standpoint, of a book in which light and shade are distributed differently, and here and there more justly, but I doubt if it will ever be possible to re-enthronize the gods who are here deposed, or in the main essentials to arrange otherwise the hierarchy of German literature since Goethe's death. Meyer deserves the credit of having given us the first History of German Literature in the Nineteenth Century which, notwithstanding its excessive detail, is written from a cosmopolitan point of view.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

University of Strassburg, Germany.

FRENCH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE.

Anleitung zum Studium der Französischen Philologie für Studierende, Lehrer und Lehrerinnen, von DR. EDUARD KOSCHWITZ, Professor an der Universität Marburg. Zweite, vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900. 8vo, vii and 183 pp.

It is a pleasure to find that Prof. Koschwitz's eminently practical *Anleitung zum Studium der Französischen Philologie*, Marburg, 1897, has already reached its second edition. It is just such a guide as every American, as well

as every German, student needs both for his work at home and for a trip abroad for purposes of study.

This second edition has been increased in size by the addition of some forty-five pages of reading-matter and an index. The work has not been rewritten, but additional paragraphs have been inserted on: *Französische Schriften über Deutschland*; *Reisen in die Provinz*; *Ferienkurse zu Nancy und Grenoble*; and *Annahme von Lehrerstellen*. At the same time numerous paragraphs already appearing in the first edition have been remodeled, either in whole or in part, and the many bibliographical references have been brought up to date as regards new works which have appeared in the last few years, while at the end there have been appended several opinions of the first edition which were published in some of the leading scholarly journals.

Of interest to American scholars will be the newly added references to Dr. Hugo P. Thieme's bibliography of French literature during the nineteenth century.¹ In glancing over the Index one is surprised not to find the name of M. Paul Meyer, although that of his *confrère*, M. Gaston Paris, appears conspicuously. A few unimportant paragraphs are found to have been omitted, but extensive additions are to be noted in the lists of students' boarding-houses given for Paris, and also for certain Swiss towns much frequented by German students.

The change in type noticeable in the second edition appears to have been for the better in the matter of clearness, but it is a subject for regret that the headings given in the Table of Contents were not repeated in the body of the work. The only misprints noted were 1855 for 1885 on page 112, and *Glédad* for *Clédad* on page 113.

This little manual is designed to serve as a guide, both for those who wish to fit themselves for the practical work of the classroom in teaching Modern French, and for those who desire to take up the serious study of the French language and literature in preparation for positions in the faculties of the German universities. In it Prof. Koschwitz has once more given proof of his grasp upon the prac-

¹ See pp. 140 and 144.